DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 166 UD 032 846

TITLE Project SAFE Alternative School, 1996-97. Research Report on an Educational Program.

INSTITUTION Houston Independent School District, TX. Dept. of Research and Accountability.

PUB DATE 1997-00-00
NOTE 17p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attendance; Black Students; Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; *High Risk Students; *Nontraditional Education; Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Student Attitudes; Urban Schools; *Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS African Americans; *Houston Independent School District TX

ABSTRACT

The Student Assistance to Further Education (SAFE) Alternative School was designed to provide academic and support services to eligible Houston Independent School District (HISD) (Texas) elementary school students at risk of expulsion. Students are referred to the school by school staff at participating schools or their parents. The program, which began in February 1997, was evaluated in its initial year of operation. Twelve students from 9 elementary schools participated. All were African Americans and all were eligible for free school lunches. The average attendance rate for these students was 92%, which exceeded the target attendance rate. Eleven of the 12 were promoted to the next grade, and 5 were recommended for the program for the following year. Students thought that the teachers were helping them, but 82% indicated that they would prefer their regular schools. Staff from the sending schools indicated that they would recommend the program to other schools. Recommendations are made for program continuation and improvement. Appendixes contain the parent, student, and referring school staff surveys and an alternative school referral form. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 428 166

RESEARCH

Report on an Educational Program

Department of Research and Accountability

Project SAFE Alternative School

1996–97

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K Sanchez
H.I.S.D

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Houston Independent School District

UD032 846

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Executive Summary

Project Student Assistance to Further Education (SAFE) Alternative School 1996–97

Program Description

The Student Assistance to Further Education (SAFE) Alternative School was designed to provide academic and support services to eligible HISD elementary students who are at risk of expulsion. The school focused on assisting students to excel in academics while helping them to learn the skills necessary to improve and control their behavior. Referral to the school came from school staff at the participating schools, and or the child's parent/guardian. The Martin Luther King, Jr. (MLK) Community Center's agreement with Houston Independent School District (HISD) to continue Project SAFE Alternative School for the 1996–97 school year was approved January, 1997.

The Houston ISD partially funded the program. The daily allotment paid to MLK Community Center by HISD was $19.86 per student per day. Payment was made for eligible students regardless of actual attendance statistics, from the date the program was started through May 29, 1997. For the 1996–97 school year, HISD budgeted $106,940 and the Center allocated $17,706.

The agreement between HISD and the MLK Community Center called for a comprehensive evaluation of the program which would include factual data on all services and activities performed, expenditures made by Project SAFE Alternative School, and an analysis of results and benefits obtained by the students served in the program. The following research questions were addressed:

1. What were the selection criteria and intake procedures for students attending Project SAFE Alternative School during the 1996–97 school year?
2. What were the demographic characteristics (ethnicity, gender, grade, age, free-lunch, and at-risk) of the students attending Project SAFE Alternative School during the 1996–97 school year?
3. What were the background characteristics (e.g., certification and employment history), of the staff at Project SAFE Alternative School?
4. What support services and instructional programs were available to students attending Project SAFE Alternative School during the 1996–97 school year?
5. Was the attendance rate of the students enrolled at Project SAFE Alternative School for a minimum of 18 weeks at least 70%?
6. Were at least 50% of the students enrolled at Project SAFE Alternative School for a minimum of 18 weeks promoted?
7. What expenditures were made by the Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Center to operate Project SAFE Alternative School?
8. What were the perceptions of parents, students, and sending school personnel regarding Project SAFE Alternative School?

Findings

- The Project SAFE Alternative School was opened during the second week of February 1997. Twelve students from nine (Blackshear, Brookline, Dodson, Douglass, Foster, Hartsfield, Kelso, MacArthur, and Montgomery) elementary schools participated in the program.

- A Referral Initiation Form that included information on the students' behavior and the intervention strategies the sending schools utilized was used to refer students to Project SAFE Alternative School. If the student was accepted to the program, the parent/guardian withdrew the student from the home school and enrolled him/her in Project SAFE Alternative School.

- All of the students were African Americans and all were afforded Free School Lunch. A majority, 71%, of the students were males. One of the students was in second grade, four in third grade, two in fourth grade, four in fifth grade, and one in sixth grade. The students' ages ranged from 7 to 12 years. Approximately 50% of the students were referred for fighting. Other student characteristics mentioned as referral reasons included: inappropriate sexual behavior, profanity, class failure, leaving assigned area and or campus, disrespect, violence, and possession of a weapon.

- The Project SAFE Alternative School staff included three certified teachers, a teacher aid, and a clerk. A physical Education instructor and six counselors from the Center were available as needed.

- The students were provided with individualized instruction from the teachers and volunteers. Individual counseling, physical motivation, self-discipline techniques, and peer mediation was provided by staff from the Center. The students also participated in group sessions initiated by an HISD officer.

- The Project SAFE Alternative School was operational for 64 days. The average attendance rate was 92% which exceeded the agreed upon attendance rate of at least 70%.

- Eleven of the 12 students were promoted. Four of these students graduated from the fifth grade and the one 6th grade student was promoted to middle school. Five of the remaining students were recommended to return to the program for the 1997–98 school year. One student was retained.

- The Houston ISD partially funded the program. The daily allotment paid to MLK Community Center by HISD was $19.86 per student per day. Payment was made for eligible students regardless of actual attendance statistics, from the date the program was started through May 29, 1997. For the 1996–97 school year, HISD budgeted $106,940 and the Center allocated $17,706.

- The parents who completed a survey reported that although it was too early to tell, the school was teaching their children to be responsible for their actions and behavior. One parent commented that they needed transportation.

- All students who completed a survey reported that teachers at this school were teaching them things that will help them later in life. Over 90% indicated that their teachers at this school want them to do well in school and to do better at their home school. On the other hand, 82% of the respondents indicated that they like going to their home school as opposed to Project SAFE Alternative School.

- All of the sending school personnel who completed a survey indicated that (1) the intake and exit guidelines were provided to them; (2) the completion of the referral forms was not too complicated and did not take too much of their time; and (3) they would recommend the Project SAFE Alternative school to other schools.

Recommendations

1. To operate the program in its full capacity, it is recommended that program personnel inform schools of program availability and to start the 1997–98 school year on schedule to accommodate the students who were recommended to return to Project SAFE Alternative School.

2. The results of parent, student, and sending school surveys showed that the Project SAFE Alternative School was beneficial to them and should continue. It is recommended that the school continue providing services to students who experience problems conforming to the traditional school environment.

3. Transportation was a problem for the participants and their parents/guardians. It is recommended that program personnel from Project SAFE and HISD address transportation issues prior to the opening of the 1997–98 school year.

Project Student Assistance to Further Education (SAFE) Alternative School 1996–97

Purpose: *To describe program implementation of Project SAFE Alternative School and present the type of services provided to participants.*

Design: *Descriptive.*

Population, Sample: *At-Risk students referred from elementary schools at the South (one school) and South Central Administrative Districts.*

Methods: *Site visits to the academy were performed. Student, parent, and sending school personnel surveys were conducted. Responses were tabulated and comments were recorded.*

Findings: *The Project SAFE Alternative School was opened during the second week of February, 1997. Twelve African American students participated. Eleven of the students were promoted and the attendance rate was 92%. The student survey results showed that the participants benefited from the program. Also, parents and personnel from the sending schools reported that the program was needed and should continue.*

Conclusions: *Students showed improvement in their behavior, attendance, and academic performance as measured by their course grade. Positive results could mean that a different setting such as Project SAFE Alternative School may be more effective for those students who cannot learn in a traditional school setting.*

Introduction

Background

The Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Center (MLKJCC) is a comprehensive social service agency located in the Third Ward. For the past 27 years, the center has been providing services for community youth through its afternoon tutorials and a summer enrichment program for youth and their families. During the 1995–96 school year, MLK Community Center entered into an agreement with HISD to operate an HISD Schools of the Future site by providing educational services to students who are at risk of expulsion and have a critical need for intervention.

In January, 1996, the Students' Assistance to Further Education (SAFE) Alternative School was established at the MLK Center as the first alternative elementary school in the state of Texas. The Center's agreement with HISD to continue the SAFE School program for the 1996–97 school year was approved January, 1997. The Project SAFE Alternative School started during the third week of February, 1997.

Program Description

The Project SAFE Alternative School was designed to provide academic and support services to eligible HISD elementary students who are at risk of expulsion. The school focused on assisting students to excel in academics while helping them to learn the skills they need to improve and control their behavior. Referral to the school came from school staff at the participating schools, and or the child's parent/guardian.

Program components included counseling, case management, and parental involvement activities. The minimum time a student could stay in the program was nine (9) weeks. Students were released (could re-enroll at home school) only when it was deemed appropriate by the program staff, parent, child, and a representative from the Alternative Education Administrative District. The center provided meals, regardless of students' school lunch status. Transportation was not provided except for special circumstances such as field trips. There was no nurse on duty at the center. The nurse at the neighboring schools was

called upon in case of emergencies. Text books and instructional materials were provided by HISD. Also, Project SAFE Alternative School teachers participated in staff development activities offered at the Alternative Education Administrative District.

Program Goals

The primary goal of the program was to provide academic and counseling services to meet individual needs of participants. The mission statement of Project SAFE Alternative School reads: The SAFE program of the MLKJCC, Inc., exists to provide an environment to promote educational excellence to every child who enters our doors. We believe every child can and will learn when taught in a nurturing atmosphere that meet the diverse needs of each student. We strive to provide all students with the fundamental skills for their own personal growth through an integrated and relevant curriculum thus enabling the student to function successfully into the twenty-first century. We are setting the standard by which excellence is measured.

Program Cost and Funding Source

The Houston ISD partially funded the program. The daily allotment paid to MLK Community Center by HISD was $19.86 per student per day. Payment was made for eligible students regardless of actual attendance statistics, from the date the program was started through May 29, 1997. For the 1996–97 school year, HISD budgeted $106,940 and the Center allocated $17,706.

Purpose of the Evaluation Report

The agreement between HISD and the MLK Community Center called for a comprehensive evaluation of the program which would include factual data on all services and activities performed, expenditures made by the Center and an analysis of results and benefits obtained by the students served in the program. The following research questions were addressed:

1. What were the selection criteria and intake procedures for students attending Project SAFE Alternative School during the 1996–97 school year?
2. What were the demographic characteristics (ethnicity, gender, grade, age, free-lunch, and at-risk) of the students attending Project SAFE Alternative School during the 1996–97 school year?
3. What were the background characteristics (e.g., certification and employment history), of the staff at Project SAFE Alternative School?
4. What support services and instructional programs were available to students attending Project SAFE Alternative School during the 1996–97 school year?
5. Was the attendance rate of the students enrolled at Project SAFE Alternative School for a minimum of 18 weeks at least 70%?
6. Were at least 50% of the students enrolled at Project SAFE Alternative School for a minimum of 18 weeks promoted?
7. What expenditures were made by the Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Center to operate Project SAFE Alternative School?
8. What were the perceptions of parents, students, and sending school personnel regarding Project SAFE Alternative School?

Methods

Data included in this report reflect information on program implementation obtained as of June, 1997. Demographic information was generated from the Class Attendance Record (CAR) maintained at the school. Information on academic performance and information regarding the services provided, activities performed, and staffing were gathered during site visits and discussions with the program coordinator and other staff members at Project SAFE Alternative School. A survey for parents, students, and sending school personnel was administered in May, 1997 to elicit the parents', students', and sending school personnel's perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the program. See **Appendices A, B,** and **C** for the surveys. Completed surveys from five parents, 11 students, and 12 principals, 2 assistant principals, two magnet coordinators, two counselors, and one teacher were received. The responses were tabulated and percentages were computed. Because of rounding, percents do not always add up to 100. The responses to open-ended questions were also recorded.

Participants

Participants were students who were at risk of expulsion from their home school. Elementary schools from the South (Montgomery) and (Blackshear, Brookline, Dodson, Douglass, Foster, Hartsfield, Kelso, and MacArthur) South Central Administrative Districts referred students to Project SAFE Alternative School.

Results

What were the selection criteria and intake procedures for students attending Project SAFE Alternative School during the 1996–97 school year?

A Referral Initiation Form (see **Appendix D**) was used to refer students. This form included information on the students' behavior and the intervention strategies the schools utilized. The referral process was as follows:

1. Sending schools completed a Referral Form. A copy of the Referral Form was sent to Project SAFE and the Alternative District.
2. If a review of the referral by Project SAFE staff indicated that the student was an acceptable candidate, the sending school's contact person was notified.
3. An intake conference with the parent/guardian, student, and a representative from Project SAFE staff, the sending school, and the Alternative Education Administrative district was scheduled.
4. If the student was accepted to the program, the parents withdrew the student from the home school and enrolled him/her in Project SAFE.
5. Students who do not fully withdraw from the home school and whose records were incomplete were not enrolled in Project SAFE.
6. In the event that a parent/guardian initiated the referral of the child to Project SAFE, Project SAFE staff and a representative from the Alternative Education Administrative District worked with the home school to fully process the withdrawal and transfer of the child.
7. Accountability stayed with the home school unless the student was enrolled at Project SAFE for 18 weeks or longer.
8. An exit conference included discussion of the appropriate setting for re-enrollment in home school or other facility.

What were the demographic characteristics (ethnicity, gender, grade, age, free-lunch, and at-risk) of the students attending Project SAFE Alternative School during the 1996–97 school year?

Twelve students from 9 (Blackshear, Brookline, Dodson, Douglass, Hartsfield, Kelso, MacArthur, and Montgomery) elementary schools participated in the program. All were African Americans and on Free School Lunch. A majority, 71%, of the students were males. One of the students was in second grade, four in third grade, two in fourth grade, four in fifth grade, and one in sixth grade. The students' ages ranged from 7 to 12 years.

According to the information obtained from Project SAFE Alternative School, approximately 50% of the students were referred for fighting. Other student characteristics mentioned as referral reasons included: inappropriate sexual behavior, profanity, class failure, leaving assigned area and or campus, disrespect, violence and possession of a weapon.

What were the background characteristics (e.g., certification and employment history), of the staff at Project SAFE Alternative School?

The Project SAFE Alternative School staff included three certified teachers, a teacher aid, and a clerk. One teacher served as the program coordinator and was a retired HISD teacher. Additionally, one of the teachers was a retired HISD counselor and the teacher aid was a retired HISD teacher as well. Two of the teachers were with the program when it started in 1995–96. A physical Education instructor and six counselors from the Center were available as needed.

What support services and instructional programs were available to students attending Project SAFE Alternative School during the 1996–97 school year?

In addition to small class size, the students were provided with individualized instruction from the teachers and volunteers. Individual counseling, physical motivation, self-discipline techniques, and peer mediation were provided by the Center staff. The students also participated in group sessions initiated by an HISD officer. Although parental involvement was minimal, Project SAFE Alternative School staff accommodated parents as needed and are exploring different strategies for starting parent meetings.

Was the attendance rate of the students enrolled at Project SAFE Alternative School for a minimum of 18 weeks at least 70%?

The Project SAFE Alternative School was operational for 64 days. The number of days the students were enrolled in the program ranged from 13 days to

64 days. While one student had 16 days of absence, a majority, 92%, of the students had less than 9 days of absences. One student had perfect attendance. The average attendance rate was 92% and exceeded the agreed upon attendance rate of a minimum of 70%.

Were at least 50% of the students enrolled at Project SAFE Alternative School for a minimum of 18 weeks promoted?

Course credit was given to students upon 70% mastery of the state essential elements for each course. Eleven students out of the twelve were promoted. Four of these students graduated from the fifth grade and the one 6th grade student was promoted to middle school. Five of the remaining students from those who were promoted were recommended to return to the program for the 1997–98 school year. One student was retained in the fourth grade and was recommended to return to the home school for the 1996–97 school year.

What expenditures were made by the Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Center, Inc., to operate Project SAFE Alternative School?

The Houston ISD partially funded the program. The daily allotment paid to MLK Community Center by HISD was $19.86 per student per day. Payment was made for eligible students regardless of actual attendance statistics, from the date the program was started through May 29, 1997. For the 1996–97 school year, HISD budgeted $106,940 and the Center allocated $17,706.

What were the perceptions of parents, students, and sending school personnel regarding Project SAFE Alternative School?

Parent Survey Results

A tally of the responses by the number and percent of respondents is presented in **Table 1.** All parents responded to two thirds of the statements in the affirmative. Forty percent of the respondents

Table1: Number and Percent of Parent Survey Respondents

Survey Questions	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
• The purpose of the Project SAFE was fully explained to me.	5	100	0	0	0	0
• The guidelines and contract for attending Project SAFE were explained to me and to my child.	5	100	0	0	0	0
• I am satisfied with the information provided by the Project SAFE regarding my child(ren)'s progress.	5	100	0	0	0	0
• I have noticed a positive change in my child's behavior after he/she attended Project SAFE for two or more weeks.	3	60	1	20	1	20
• The Project SAFE is able to address the needs of my child(ren) better than the home school.	3	60	1	20	1	20
• I did not have a problem with completing the referral papers at my child's home school.	2	40	2	40	1	20
• The teachers and staff at Project SAFE were easily accessible to me.	5	100	0	0	0	0
• The Project SAFE provides a lot of opportunities for me to be involved in my child(ren)'s education.	5	100	0	0	0	0
• In my opinion, the Project SAFE should continue.	5	100	0	0	0	0

indicated that they had a problem with completing the referral papers at their child's home school. Four of the five respondents added comments. A summary of their responses was that although it was too early to tell, the school was teaching their children to be responsible for their actions and behavior. One parent commented that they needed transportation.

Student Survey Results

A tally of the responses is presented in **Table 2.** The number and percent of the respondents is given. Overall, the responses were positive. All reported that teachers at this school were teaching them things that will help them later in life. Over 90% indicated that their teachers at this school want them to do well in school and to do better at their home school. On the other hand, 82% of the respondents indicated that they like going to their home school as opposed to Project SAFE Alternative School.

Table 2: Number and Percent of Student Survey Respondents

	Yes		No		Don't Know	
Survey Questions	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
• I like going to this school.	6	55	3	27	2	18
• I like going to my home school.	9	82	2	18	0	0
• Teachers at this school are fair.	5	46	4	36	2	18
• The people who work at this school care about me.	6	55	1	9	4	36
• This school is a safe place to be.	5	46	2	18	4	36
• Teachers at this school help students do their best.	7	64	0	0	4	36
• My teachers at this school care if I do my homework.	7	64	2	18	2	18
• My teachers at this school want me to do well in school.	10	91	1	9	0	0
• My teachers at this school encourage me to learn.	8	73	1	9	2	18
• My teachers at this school tell me when I do really well.	9	82	1	9	1	9
• My teachers at this school make learning fun.	6	55	2	18	3	27
• Students know how they are supposed to behave at this school.	4	36	5	46	2	18
• Teachers at this school teach me how to behave when I return to my home school.	9	82	1	9	1	9
• Teachers at this school are teaching me things that will help me later in life.	11	100	0	0	0	0
• My teachers at this school tell me that I am expected to learn.	8	73	1	9	2	18
• My teachers at this school want me to do better in my home school.	10	91	0	0	1	9
• I have learned how to handle conflict at this school.	7	64	2	18	2	18
• At this school, I have learned how important it is to stay in school.	8	73	1	9	2	18
• I have learned about being a better student at this school.	8	73	3	27	0	0
• I have learned a lot about myself at this school.	9	82	2	18	0	0
• I have learned to have respect for others and myself at this school.	9	82	0	0	2	18

Sending Schools Survey Results

A tally of the responses from personnel at those schools that made referrals is presented in **Table 3.** The number and percent of respondents is given. All respondents indicated that the intake and exit guidelines were provided to them and that the completion of the referral forms was not too complicated and did not take too much of their time. Over 80% responded that they were satisfied with the information provided by Project SAFE regarding the students they referred. All responded that they would recommend the Project SAFE to other schools, and 78% responded that they would recommend Project SAFE to other teachers and that Project SAFE should continue. Of the personnel at the schools that did not make any referrals, 60% responded that the intake and exit guidelines were provided to them and that Project SAFE should continue.

The survey for the sending school personnel included two open-ended questions and a section on comments and or suggestions as well. The open-ended question followed by the responses provided was as follows.

Question: In your opinion, how has the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School benefited the student(s) you have referred? Please explain briefly.

Table 3: Number and Percent of Sending Schools Survey Respondents

	Yes		No		N/A	
Survey Question	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
• The intake and exit guidelines were provided to me.	9	100	0	0	0	0
• The completion of referral forms took too much of my time.	0	0	9	100	0	0
• The completion of referral forms was too complicated.	0	0	9	100	0	0
• The Project SAFE is able to address the needs of my students better than the home school.	7	67	1	11	2	22
• I am satisfied with the information provided by the Project SAFE regarding the students I referred.	8	89	1	11	0	0
• The students who re-entered my class/home school were able to continue their lesson with the rest of the class without any problem.	2	22	1	11	7	67
• I noticed positive changes in the behavior of the students who re-entered my class/home school.	2	22	1	11	7	67
• I would recommend the Project SAFE to other teachers.	7	78	1	11	1	11
• I would recommend the Project SAFE to other schools.	9	100	0	0	0	0
• In my opinion, the Project SAFE should continue.	7	78	0	0	2	22

- The center gave our students a different environment with a low pupil/teacher ratio.
- The MLK Project has provided an alternative to continuous suspensions with no improvement and loss of class time. Through this program students receive new strategies to control their behavior.
- I am thankful the MLK Project SAFE school was available to be an alternative for being out of school at home for my student.
- We have not referred anyone.
- This year we did not refer anyone as when we were needing to, the contract for the year had not

yet been approved and the school was not yet taking students

Question: What types of changes would you like to see in the intake and exit procedures?

- Intake packet should be provided to the parents on rules and expectations. Also reasons why a student may not return to home school after the nine weeks.
- Exit-parent conference held at the time of exit.
- I am satisfied with the procedures.
- Better information and helping attitude provided by phone to assist us.

Comments/ Suggestions:

- Area will inservice for those districts not aware of the school. Alternative paper work should be sent to each school site.
- This is a good alternative for some students.
- I think every school in this area should know about the program.
- I think school should continue as elementaries need alternatives available.

Conclusions

The Project SAFE Alternative School was opened during the second week of February 1997 and was operational for 64 days. Because of the delay in starting the program some schools could not refer their students to the program. The 12 students who participated in the program were provided with individualized instruction, individual counseling, physical motivation, self-discipline techniques, and peer mediation.

Although the duration of the program was short, the Project SAFE Alternative School staff completed the necessary steps for the students to continue their education for the 1997–98 school year, either at their home school or Project SAFE Alternative School. The parent, student, and sending school personnel survey results showed that the program was beneficial to the them. Also, students showed improvement in their behavior, attendance, and academic performance. Positive results could mean that a different setting such as Project SAFE Alternative School may be more effective for those students who experience problems conforming to the traditional school environment.

Recommendations

1. To operate the program in its full capacity, it is recommended that program personnel inform schools of program availability and to start the 1997–98 school year on schedule to accommodate the students who were recommended to return to Project SAFE Alternative School.

2. The results of parent, student, and sending school surveys showed that the Project SAFE Alternative School was beneficial to them and should continue. It is recommended that the school continue providing services to students who experience problems conforming to the traditional school environment.

3. Transportation was a problem for the participants and their parents/guardians. It is recommended that program personnel from Project SAFE and HISD address transportation issues prior to the opening of the 1997–98 school year.

Appendix A

HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., PROJECT SAFE ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL
PARENT SURVEY, 1996–97

Your opinions about the Martin Luther King, Jr., (MLK) Community Center Project Student Assistance to Further Education (SAFE) Alternative School are very important in assessing the effectiveness of the program. Please complete this survey as fully as you can and return to the Program Coordinator. Your responses are anonymous and will not be associated with you or your child in any way.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and your time!

1. How many children do you have in the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School?_____

2. Please provide the following information for your child(ren) attending the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School.

   (a) Grade Level: _____ (b) Gender: _____ (c) Age: _____

   (a) Grade Level: _____ (b) Gender: _____ (c) Age: _____

3. What is the HISD home school of your child?_____

Please place a check mark (√) under the response that best describes your answer.

Survey Questions	Yes	No	Don't Know
4. The purpose of the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School was fully explained to me.			
5. The guidelines and contract for attending the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School were explained to me and to my child.			
6. I am satisfied with the information provided by the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School regarding my child(ren)'s progress.			
7. I have noticed a positive change in my child's behavior after he/she attended the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School for two or more weeks.			
8. The MLK Project SAFE Alternative School is able to address the needs of my child(ren) better than the home school.			
9. I did not have a problem with completing the referral papers at my child's home school.			
10. The teachers and staff at the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School were easily accessible to me.			
11. The MLK Project SAFE Alternative School provides a lot of opportunities for me to be involved in my child(ren)'s education.			
12. In my opinion, the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School should continue.			

Over

Appendix A (Continued)

13. In your opinion, how has the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School benefited your child(ren)? Please explain briefly.

14. What suggestions would you make to improve the quality of services at the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School?

Appendix B

HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., PROJECT SAFE ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL
STUDENT SURVEY, 1996–97

1. Boy Girl (circle one)

2. What is your grade level? K 1 2 3 4 5 (circle one)

3. What school did you go to before coming to MLK Project SAFE Alternative School?

_____

Circle ONLY ONE answer for each of the following statements

4.	I like going to this school.	Yes	No	Don't Know
5.	I like going to my home school.	Yes	No	Don't Know
6.	Teachers at this school are fair.	Yes	No	Don't Know
7.	The people who work at this school care about me.	Yes	No	Don't Know
8	This school is a safe place to be.	Yes	No	Don't Know
9.	Teachers at this school help students do their best.	Yes	No	Don't Know
10.	My teachers at this school care if I do my homework.	Yes	No	Don't Know
11.	My teachers at this school want me to do well in school.	Yes	No	Don't Know
12.	My teachers at this school encourage me to learn.	Yes	No	Don't Know
13.	My teachers at this school tell me when I do really well.	Yes	No	Don't Know
14.	My teachers at this school make learning fun.	Yes	No	Don't Know
15.	Students know how they are supposed to behave at this school.	Yes	No	Don't Know
16.	Teachers at this school teach me how to behave when I return to my home school.	Yes	No	Don't Know
17.	Teachers at this school are teaching me things that will help me later in life.	Yes	No	Don't Know
18.	My teachers at this school tell me that I am expected to learn.	Yes	No	Don't Know
19.	My teachers at this school want me to do better in my home school.	Yes	No	Don't Know
20.	I have learned how to handle conflict at this school.	Yes	No	Don't Know
21.	At this school, I have learned how important it is to stay in school.	Yes	No	Don't Know
22.	I have learned about being a better student at this school.	Yes	No	Don't Know
23.	I have learned a lot about myself at this school.	Yes	No	Don't Know
24.	I have learned to have respect for others and myself at this school.	Yes	No	Don't Know

Teachers may assist students with reading difficulties.

Appendix C

HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., PROJECT SAFE ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL
SENDING SCHOOL SURVEY, 1996–97

Your opinions about the Martin Luther King, Jr., (MLK) Community Center, Project Student Assistance to Further Education (SAFE) Alternative School are very important in assessing the effectiveness of the program. Please complete this survey as fully as you can and return to the principal. Your responses are anonymous and will not be used to assess you or your school. ***Thank you very much for your cooperation!***

Please indicate your response by putting a check (√) mark in the space provided.

1. Your Position: ☐ Principal ☐ Ass't. Principal ☐ Teacher
   Other: _____

2. Were you aware of the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   (a) If "Yes", please explain how and where you obtained the information. _____
   _____
   _____
   (b) If "No", please go to the comments section.

3. Did you refer any students to the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   (a) If "Yes", please indicate the number of students you referred for each grade level in the space provided.

Grade Level(s)	K	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Students Referred	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

   (b) If "No", please explain why.
   _____
   _____

		Yes	No	N/A
4.	The intake and exit guidelines were provided to me.			
5.	The completion of referral forms took too much of my time.			
6	The completion of referral forms was too complicated.			
7.	The MLK Project SAFE Alternative School is able to address the needs of my students better than the home school.			
8.	I am satisfied with the information provided by the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School regarding the students I referred.			
9.	The students who re-entered my class/home school were able to continue their lesson with the rest of the class without any problem.			
10.	I noticed positive changes in the behavior of students who re-entered my class/home school.			
11.	I would recommend the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School to other teachers.			
12.	I would recommend the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School to other schools.			
13.	In my opinion, the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School should continue.			

Over

Appendix C (Continued)

14. In your opinion, how has the MLK Project SAFE Alternative School benefited the student(s) you have referred? Please explain briefly.

15. What types of changes would you like to see in the intake and exit procedures?

16. Comments/Suggestions:

Appendix D

ALTERNATIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REFERRAL INITIATION FORM

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Student Name: _____ Student I.D. #: _____
Student Address: _____ Student D.O.B: _____ Sex: M _____ F_____
Parent Guardian Name: _____ Parent Guardian Home Phone: _____

Work Phone: _____ Emergency Phone: _____
Referral Source:_____ Mail Address/Route: _____
Grade Placement: _____ Date of Referral _____ Age of Student _____

Ethnicity (circle one): Black White/Non-Hispanic Hispanic Other

Educational Program (circle all that apply):

Regular Ed. Special Ed.: Option 1 2 3 4 LEP: ESL BIL. Category C

Latest Reading Score/Grade level: _____/____Latest Math Score/Grade level: _____/_____

Lunch Status: (circle one) FREE REDUCED NA

II. STUDENT STATUS (circle one): EXPELLED IN LIEU OF EXPULSION

III. REASON(S) FOR REFERRAL (check all those which apply)

- ❒ 1. Class Failures
- ❒ 2. Excessive Tardiness
- ❒ 3. Cheating
- ❒ 4. Leaving Class/Assigned Area
- ❒ 5. LeavingCampus
- ❒ 6. Truancy/Refusal to Attend
- ❒ 7. Possession/Use of Alcohol/Drugs
- ❒ 8. Disruption on Bus
- ❒ 9. Profanity/Inappr. Language
- ❒ 10. Property Destruction
- ❒ 11. Stealing
- ❒ 12. Fighting
- ❒ 13. Inappropriate Sexual Behavior
- ❒ 14. Disrespect/Defiance of Authority
- ❒ 15. Possession/Use of a Weapon
- ❒ 16. Violent Antisocial Behavior
- ❒ 17. Gang Activity
- ❒ 18. Gambling
- ❒ 19. Robbery
- ❒ 20. Extortion
- ❒ 21. Arson
- ❒ 22. Other

IV. SCHOOL SITE INTERVENTIONS ATTEMPTED (check all those which apply)

- ❒ 1. Behavior Modification System (explain on back)
- ❒ 2. Parent/Teacher/Adm. Conference (# of times _____)
- ❒ 3. Counseling/ School Agency (# of times _____)
- ❒ 4. Detention/ # of Days _____
- ❒ 5. In-School Suspension/# of Days_____
- ❒ 6. Pressed Charges with Police
- ❒ 7. Suspension / # of Days __ # ofTimes __
- ❒ 8. Expulsion/ # of Days _____
- ❒ 9. Restitution
- ❒ 10.Other:

Do Not Write Below This Line

APPROVED ❒ DISAPPROVED ❒ DATE: _____

_____ ADMINISTRATOR

Reason for Disapproval: _____

_____

17